UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,311	02/07/2001	Kevin Callahan	54151.07US1	5646

34018   7590   10/24/2005

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
77 WEST WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 2500
CHICAGO, IL 60601-1732

EXAMINER
STERRETT, JONATHAN G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/778,311	CALLAHAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan G. Sterrett	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This **Final** Office Action is responsive to applicant's amendment filed August 10,

2005. Currently **Claims 1-36** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed on August 10, 2005 with respect to **Claims 1-36** have

been considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's first argument on page 1 regarding PointServe not

teaching the cited limitation of "**determining at least one available repair time slot**

based on the geographic identifier", the examiner respectfully disagrees. The cited

reference (Reference V1) on page 2 paragraph 8 lines 1-4 teaches this limitation. Here

the reference discloses that PointServe integrates a Geographic Information System

(GIS) into their ServiceXchange function. The reference further points out that this

ServiceXchange manages the scheduling and routing (and other functions) of repair

services. The GIS system provides this claimed functionality to the scheduling system

by providing the ability to take into account the distances traveled by a repair provider

and the impact this would have on scheduling. See also page 2 paragraph 3 line 2-3,

where it teaches that scheduling and routing are used in conjunction with each other to

manage a field service workforce. Further see page 3 under the paragraph "About

PointServe" line 3-4, "**PointServe solutions optimize all of the elements associated**

with mobile service delivery, including scheduling, routing, delivery and

tracking". Optimizing scheduling and routing requires determining repair slots based on the location of where the service is to be provided (i.e. based on the geographic identifier).

The applicant's argument against the Pointserve reference is that the time slot data is not provided to the customer for selection (Page 3 line 7-9 "**which is then provided to a customer for selection, as is claimed**"). However, nowhere in the claims is the limitation "**provided to a customer for selection**" cited. The claims cite the time slot selection data being provided *to the client device* as per Claims 1 and 20.

Specifically Claim 1 cites "**transmitting data indicative of the at least one available repair time slot *to the client device* [italics added] via the wide area network**". PointServe discloses all the limitations of the claim since the service provider's client device is receiving data indicative of at least one available repair time slot via the wide area network.

The applicant is reminded that the MPEP (2111[R]) is very clear that "though understanding the claim language may be aided by explanations contained in the written description, **it is important not to import into a claim limitations that are not part of the claim** *(emphasis added)*. For example, a particular embodiment appearing in the written description may not be read into a claim when the claim language is broader than the embodiment."); E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

The definition of the term "client device" in its broadest scope can include anyone

who is using a client device to access the wide area network, including service

providers and customers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 1-7, 9-29 and 31-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Whirlpool.com** in view of PointServe.com (**PointServe**).

Whirlpool.com is contained in the following references (designations maintained

from Office Action of February 1, 2005):

    Reference A: "KitchenAid Appliance Diagnostic System" archive.org website of

6/26/1997;

    Reference B: "KitchenAid Repair Service Locator" archive.org website of

6/26/1997;

    Reference E; Whirlpool website search engine, archive.org website of

    1/17/1999;

Reference F; Whirlpool webpage of air conditioners hypertext links of specific

models, archive.org website of 4/29/1999.

PointServe is contained in the following references:

Hickey, Kathleen, "Right Place, Right Time", Nov 1999, Traffic World, v260, n4,

p47, Dialog 06791905 57430340, hereafter referred to as **Reference U1**.

PRNewswire, "PointServe Launches Breakthrough On-Line Scheduling Solutions

to Dramatically Improve the Reliability of Home and Business-Oriented Service Delivery

Regional Rollout to Begin in Salt Lake City on Nov 1; National Launch Slated for Early

2000", Oct 1999, p.1, ProQuest ID 45806204, hereafter referred to as **Reference V1**.

Satran, Dick, "Rocket Scientist tries improving service industry", Oct 1999,

Vancouver Sun, Vancouver, B.C., p.E2, ProQuest ID 08321299, hereafter referred to as

Reference W1.

Hall, John, R; "New Service Website Holds Promise for Contractors", Nov 1999,

Air Conditioning, Heating & Refrigeration News; 208, 13; ABI/INFORM Global, p.1,

hereafter referred to as **Reference X1**.

Regarding **Claim 1**, Whirlpool.com teaches:

receiving an appliance selection request message from a client device via a

wide area network;

Reference A, drop down menu constitutes application selection request.

the appliance selection request message being indicative of a desire to receive appliance selection data, the appliance selection data facilitating selection of a first home appliance;

Reference A, drop down menu facilitates selection of different kinds of home appliances;

transmitting the appliance selection data to the client device via the wide area network;

Reference A webpage is in communication with Whirlpool.com website.

in response to receiving the appliance selection request message; receiving an appliance identifier from the client device via the wide area network, the appliance identifier distinguishing the first home appliance from a second home appliance;

Reference A, Whirlpool.com website transmits data back to identify model and further enable customer to diagnose problem, including distinguishing between different home appliances.

receiving a geographical identifier from the client device via the wide area network;

Reference B, Whirlpool.com website transmits zip code information along with product type based on customer's input to identify a service locator.

Whirlpool.com does not teach:

determining at least one available repair time slot based on the

geographical identifier;

transmitting data indicative of the at least one available repair time slot to

the client device via the wide area network; and

receiving time slot selection data from the client device via the wide area

network.

PointServe teaches:

determining at least one available repair time slot based on the

geographical identifier;

Reference V1 page 2 paragraph 8 line 1-3, PointServe incorporates GIS

information into the software package that service providers use to manage scheduling.

This would include providing at least one available repair time slot based on the

customer location (i.e. geographical identifier).

transmitting data indicative of the at least one available repair time slot to

the client device via the wide area network;

Reference U1 page 1 paragraph 5 line 1-4, users can access a website to see

what open spaces exist in a company's schedule for service providers. PointServe

transmits the time slot data via the internet (i.e. wide area network) to the user's

computer (i.e. client device).

receiving time slot selection data from the client device via the wide area

network.

Reference V1 page 2 paragraph 2 line 1-2, customers can schedule an appointment with a service provider over the internet (i.e. wide area network). The scheduling would require that the service provider receives time slot selection data from the customer's computer (i.e. client device).

Both Whirlpool.com and PointServe address the needs of appliance owners who are accessing appliance repair information over the internet, and thus both are analogous art.

PointServe teaches that it helps companies control costs and maximize profits by optimizing the scheduling and dispatch of service workers (Reference U1 page 1 paragraph 2 line 2-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Whirlpool.com regarding providing appliance selection data over the internet, with the step of determining, transmitting and receiving time slot selection data for scheduling an appliance repair, as taught by PointServe, because it would enable costs to be controlled and profit maximized through the optimization of service scheduling.

Regarding **Claim 2**, Whirlpool.com and PointServe teach all the limitations of Claim 1 above, but Whirlpool.com does not teach:

the step of dispatching an agent of an appliance repair provider based on

the time slot.selection data.

PointServe teaches:

the step of dispatching an agent of an appliance repair provider based on

the time slot selection data.

Reference V1 page 2 paragraph 3 line 3-4, technician (i.e. agent) is dispatched

Reference V1 page 2 paragraph 2 line 1-2, since the customer is scheduling an

appointment based on time slot selection data, the technician would be dispatched

based on that time slot selection data.

Both Whirlpool.com and PointServe.com address the needs of appliance owners

who are accessing appliance repair information over the internet, and thus both are

analogous art.

PointServe teaches that it helps companies control costs and maximize profits by

optimizing the scheduling and dispatch of service workers (Reference U1 page 1

paragraph 2 line 2-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the teachings of Whirlpool.com regarding providing appliance

selection data over the internet, with the steps of scheduling an agent based on the time

slot selection data, as taught by PointServe, because it would enable costs to be

controlled and profit maximized through the optimization of service scheduling.

Regarding **Claim 3**, Whirlpool.com and PointServe teach all the limitations of

Claim 1 above, but Whirlpool.com does not teach:

the step of repairing the first home appliance, wherein the step of repairing

the first home appliance is performed after the step of receiving time slot

selection data from the client device via the wide area network.

PointServe teaches:

the step of repairing the first home appliance, wherein the step of repairing

the first home appliance is performed after the step of receiving time slot

selection data from the client device via the wide area network.

Reference V1 page 2 paragraph 8 line 1-3, PointServe schedules the technician

after the customer selects a time slot for repair – see also Reference U1 page 1

paragraph 1 line 1-2, this example details a washing machine (i.e. appliance repair)

repair person scheduled for an appointment at 9 am.

Reference V1 page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-2, PointServe provides web-based

scheduling, which includes a service provider receiving time slot selection data via the

internet (i.e. wide area network).

Both Whirlpool.com and PointServe.com address the needs of appliance owners

who are accessing appliance repair information over the internet, and thus both are

analogous art.

PointServe teaches that it helps companies control costs and maximize profits by

optimizing the scheduling and dispatch of service workers (Reference U1 page 1

paragraph 2 line 2-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the teachings of Whirlpool.com regarding providing appliance

selection data over the internet, with the step of repairing the first home appliance,

wherein the step of repairing the first home appliance is performed after the step of

receiving time slot selection data from the client device via the wide area network, as

taught by PointServe, because it would enable costs to be controlled and profit

maximized through the optimization of service scheduling.

Regarding **Claims 4 and 5**, Whirlpool.com and PointServe teach all the

limitations of Claim 1 above, and Whirlpool.com teaches:

the step of receiving an appliance selection request message comprises:

the step of receiving a hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) message

Reference A, this webpage is transmitted as an http message, as per Claim 4;

the step of receiving an appliance selection request message from a

personal computer (PC), as per Claim 5.

It is inherent that Whirlpool's webpage would have been transmitted from a client

computer that is a PC because it is old and well known in the art that PC's can locate

and display webpages, including Whirlpool's webpage, and transmit the appliance

selection request message.

Regarding Claim 6, Whirlpool.com and PointServe teach all the limitations of

Claim 1 above, and Whirlpool.com teaches:

the step of transmitting the appliance selection data comprises the step of

transmitting web page data.

Reference A, webpage that transmits appliance selection data back to the

Whirlpool website.

Regarding Claim 7, Whirlpool.com and PointServe teach all the limitations of

Claim 1 above, and Whirlpool.com teaches:

transmitting the appliance selection data comprises the step of

transmitting a list of model numbers.

Reference F page 1, Whirlpool's website contains hypertext links that denote

individual model numbers.

Regarding **Claim 9**, Whirlpool.com and PointServe teach all the limitations of

Claim 1 above, but Whirlpool.com does not teach:

transmitting the appliance selection data comprises the step of

transmitting a digital picture of an appliance.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of the internet to

display digital pictures of products via a web page. This is used by companies to

display various pictures to illustrate the visual differences between the two products.

This is an efficient way to communicate different product models to a user viewing a

website.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the collective teachings of Whirlpool.com and PointServe, regarding

providing appliance service and scheduling over the internet, to include the step of

providing digital pictures of appliance products over the internet, because it would

provide an efficient way for customers to select the correct product to be repaired.

Regarding **Claim 11**, Whirlpool.com and PointServe teach all the limitations of

Claim 1 above, and Whirlpool.com teaches:

wherein the step of transmitting the appliance selection data comprises the

step of transmitting data indicative of a search engine query area

Reference E, keyword search input on Whirlpool's webpage.

Regarding **Claim 12**, Whirlpool and PointServe teach all the limitations of Claim 1 above, and Whirlpool.com teaches:

wherein the step of receiving an appliance identifier comprises the step of receiving an appliance model number.

Reference F, model numbers of air conditioners listed on webpage.

Regarding **Claim 13**, Whirlpool and PointServe teach all the limitations of Claim 1 above, and Whirlpool.com teaches:

wherein the step of receiving an appliance identifier comprises the step of receiving an identifier associated with the appliance selection data

Reference F, model numbers are associated with the appliance selection data, in this example, room air conditioners.

Regarding **Claim 14**, Whirlpool and PointServe teach all the limitations of Claim 1 above, and Whirlpool.com teaches:

wherein the step of receiving a geographical identifier comprises the step of receiving a zip code.

Reference B: zip code input area on Whirlpool.com website for receiving a geographic identifier.

Regarding **Claim 15**, Whirlpool.com and PointServe teach all the limitations of

Claim 1 above, but Whirlpool does not teach:

wherein the step of determining at least one available repair time slot

based on the appliance identifier comprises the step of querying a database of

predetermined appliance repair providers for a particular appliance repair

provider associated with the appliance identifier.

PointServe teaches:

wherein the step of determining at least one available repair time slot

based on the appliance identifier comprises the step of querying a database of

predetermined appliance repair providers for a particular appliance repair

provider associated with the appliance identifier.

Reference V1 page 2 paragraph 2 line 2-5, customers can search online to find

the best service provider, e.g. for appliance repair the customer would search for the

appropriate appliance repair provider based on their particular appliance (i.e. appliance

identifier)—see Reference U1 page 1 paragraph 5 line 1-2, users can search on a

particular company's website for repair provider time slot.

Both Whirlpool.com and PointServe.com address the needs of appliance owners

who are accessing appliance repair information over the internet, and thus both are

analogous art.

PointServe teaches that it helps companies control costs and maximize profits by optimizing the scheduling and dispatch of service workers (Reference U1 page 1 paragraph 2 line 2-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Whirlpool.com regarding providing appliance selection data over the internet, with the step of querying a database of predetermined appliance repair providers for a particular appliance repair provider associated with the appliance identifier, as taught by PointServe, because it would enable costs to be controlled and profit maximized through the optimization of service scheduling.

Regarding **Claim 16**, Whirlpool and PointServe teach all the limitations of Claim 1 above, but Whirlpool.com does not teach:

wherein the step of determining at least one available repair time slot further comprises the step of receiving schedule data from the particular appliance repair provider.

PointServe teaches:

wherein the step of determining at least one available repair time slot further comprises the step of receiving schedule data from the particular appliance repair provider.

Reference U1 page 1 paragraph 5 line 1-3, users can access a company's schedule online to see what available slots of the company's service providers have (i.e. receiving schedule data).

Both Whirlpool.com and PointServe.com address the needs of appliance owners who are accessing appliance repair information over the internet, and thus both are analogous art.

PointServe teaches that it helps companies control costs and maximize profits by optimizing the scheduling and dispatch of service workers (Reference U1 page 1 paragraph 2 line 2-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Whirlpool.com regarding providing appliance selection data over the internet, with the step of receiving schedule data from the particular appliance repair provider, as taught by PointServe, because it would enable costs to be controlled and profit maximized through the optimization of service scheduling.

Regarding **Claim 17**, Whirlpool and PointServe teach all the limitations of Claim 1 above, but Whirlpool.com does not teach:

wherein the step of determining at least one available repair time slot based on the appliance identifier and the geographical identifier comprises the step of querying a database of predetermined appliance repair providers for a particular appliance repair provider associated with the geographical identifier.

PointServe teaches:

wherein the step of determining at least one available repair time slot based on the appliance identifier and the geographical identifier comprises the step of querying a database of predetermined appliance repair providers for a particular appliance repair provider associated with the geographical identifier

Reference V1 page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-4, users can search for appliance repair providers in their locale, in this case it is Salt Lake City, so the users would be searching online for a repair provider associated within the Salt Lake City area (i.e. geographical identifier).

Reference V1 page 2 paragraph 8 line 1-4, PointServe uses a geographic information system (GIS) to schedule particular repair service providers. Since it is optimizing scheduling, it would have to take into account the geography of the service provider in proximity to the user requesting the service.

Both Whirlpool.com and PointServe.com address the needs of appliance owners who are accessing appliance repair information over the internet, and thus both are analogous art.

PointServe teaches that it helps companies control costs and maximize profits by optimizing the scheduling and dispatch of service workers (Reference U1 page 1 paragraph 2 line 2-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Whirlpool.com regarding providing appliance selection data over the internet, with the step of step of querying a database of predetermined appliance repair providers for a particular appliance repair provider associated with the geographical identifier, as taught by PointServe, because it would enable costs to be controlled and profit maximized through the optimization of service scheduling.

Regarding **Claim 18**, Whirlpool and PointServe teach all the limitations of Claim 17 above, but Whirlpool.com does not teach:

wherein the step of determining at least one available repair time slot further comprises the step of receiving schedule data from the particular appliance repair provider.

PointServe teaches:

wherein the step of determining at least one available repair time slot further comprises the step of receiving schedule data from the particular appliance repair provider.

Reference U1 page 1 paragraph 5 line 1-3, users can receive schedule data from a particular appliance repair provider to see the open slots (i.e. available repair time slot) available for that provider to schedule a visit to repair their appliance.

Both Whirlpool.com and PointServe.com address the needs of appliance owners who are accessing appliance repair information over the internet, and thus both are analogous art.

PointServe teaches that it helps companies control costs and maximize profits by optimizing the scheduling and dispatch of service workers (Reference U1 page 1 paragraph 2 line 2-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Whirlpool.com regarding providing appliance selection data over the internet, with the step of receiving schedule data from the particular appliance repair provider, as taught by PointServe, because it would enable costs to be controlled and profit maximized through the optimization of service scheduling.

Regarding **Claim 19**, Whirlpool and PointServe teach all the limitations of Claim 1 above, but Whirlpool.com does not teach:

> **wherein the step of transmitting data indicative of the at least one available**
>
> **repair time slot comprises the step of transmitting web page data.**

PointServe teaches:

> **wherein the step of transmitting data indicative of the at least one available**
>
> **repair time slot comprises the step of transmitting web page data.**

Reference U1 page 1 paragraph 5 line 1-3, users are accessing a web site (i.e.

transmitting web page data) to receive available time slot data.

Both Whirlpool.com and PointServe.com address the needs of appliance owners

who are accessing appliance repair information over the internet, and thus both are

analogous art.

PointServe teaches that it helps companies control costs and maximize profits by

optimizing the scheduling and dispatch of service workers (Reference U1 page 1

paragraph 2 line 2-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the teachings of Whirlpool.com regarding providing appliance

selection data over the internet, with the step of receiving schedule data from the

particular appliance repair provider as web page data, as taught by PointServe,

because it would enable costs to be controlled and profit maximized through the

optimization of service scheduling.

Claims 20-29 and 31-36 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of

Claims 1-7 and 9-19 above, therefore they are rejected under the same rationale.

5.   **Claims 8 and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Whirlpool.com** in view of PointServe.com **(PointServe)** and further in view of

Francett.

Francett, Barbara, "An Exercise in Utility", June 1997, Software Magazine; 17, 6;

ABI/INFORM Global, p.75, hereafter referred to as **Reference U2**.

Regarding **Claim 8**, Whirlpool.com and PointServe teach all the limitations of

Claim 1 above, and Whirlpool.com teaches:

providing appliance information over the internet to help a customer with

servicing their appliance (Reference A).

Whirlpool.com does not teach:

receiving a user identifier from the client device via the wide area network;

and retrieving a list of model numbers from a purchase history database based

on the user identifier, wherein the step of transmitting the appliance selection

data comprises the step of transmitting the list of model numbers retrieved from

the purchase history database.

PointServe teaches:

receiving a user identifier from the client device via the wide area network;

Reference V1 page 2 paragraph 2 line 1-2, users can schedule an appointment

with a repair service provider over the internet. This would require the service provider

receiving a user identifier from the user so that the company can schedule what is being

repaired and also know who is contacting the repair service provider-see also

Reference X1 page 2 column 3 line 15 –customers accessing the system online are

required to pay a fee to access at home repair scheduling – this would require their

identity to be received over the internet.

Both Whirlpool.com and PointServe.com address the needs of appliance owners

who are accessing appliance repair information over the internet, and thus both are

analogous art.

PointServe teaches that it helps companies control costs and maximize profits by

optimizing the scheduling and dispatch of service workers (Reference U1 page 1

paragraph 2 line 2-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the teachings of Whirlpool.com regarding providing appliance

selection data over the internet, with the step of receiving a user identifier from the client

device via the wide area network, as taught by PointServe, because it would enable

costs to be controlled and profit maximized through the optimization of service

scheduling.

Whirlpool.com and PointServe do not teach:

retrieving a list of model numbers from a purchase history database based

on the user identifier, wherein the step of transmitting the appliance selection

data comprises the step of transmitting the list of model numbers retrieved from

the purchase history database.

Francett teaches:

retrieving a list of model numbers from a purchase history database based

on the user identifier, wherein the step of transmitting the appliance selection

data comprises the step of transmitting the list of model numbers retrieved from

the purchase history database.

Reference U2 page 76 paragraph 5 line 1-6, the service provider accesses a

database (i.e. purchase history database) to determine what appliances the customer

has (i.e. their purchase history), so that the repair person has the right parts when they

make the service call. This would include retrieving a list of model numbers from the

database of customer purchases so that the technician has the appropriate parts when

the call is made.

Whirlpool, PointServe and Francett all address providing appliance repair service to customers at their home, thus all are analogous art (See Reference U2 page 75 paragraph 4 line 1-5 – PSE&G targeted servicing home appliances in addition to their traditional utility-based business).

Francett teaches that applying information technology tools provides improvements in efficiency and lowers costs (Reference U2 page 75 paragraph 5 line 3-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the collective teachings of Whirlpool.com and PointServe regarding providing internet-based servicing and scheduling of home appliance repair, to include transmitting a list of model numbers from a purchase history database to facilitate selection of the proper model to be repaired, as taught by Francett, because it would provide efficiency and cost reduction improvements by ensuring that the appliance to be repaired would be correctly identified.

Claim 30 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of **Claim 8** above, therefore it is rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

6.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jonathan G. Sterrett whose telephone number is 571-

272-6881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

8.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JGS

JGS 10-19-05

SUSANNA M. DIAZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 3623